

REMARKS

Claim 11 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 13-14 and claims 13-14 have been canceled. Claim 11 also has been amended to include the language previously added to claim 9 reciting that some user authorization methods have "different associated security levels than others." Support for the change to claim 11 may be found in Figure 7 and in claims 1 and 9. No new matter has been entered and no new issues have been raised by these changes that would require further consideration or search by the Examiner. Accordingly, entry of the proposed amendments is proper and is requested. Upon entry of the proposed amendments, claims 1-12 and 15-20 will remain in the application.

Rejections of Claims 11-20

Claims 11 and 15-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Nielsen (USP 6,182,229). Claims 12, 13, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Nielsen in view of Bellemore et al. (US 6,145,086). Finally, claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Nielsen and Bellemore et al. in view of Brown et al. (US 6,618,806). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 11 relates to a method of changing a first password for securing files accessible by password data entry to a second other password, including:

determining a plurality of files secured with the first password;

authorizing an individual requesting a change of the first password prior to changing the first password by determining a user authorization method having an associated security level sufficient for accessing the secured first password, where some user authorization methods have different associated security levels than others, and authorizing an individual according to the determined user authorization method;

when the individual is authorized, providing a second other password for securing the plurality of files;

for each file secured with the first password, accessing the file with the first password and securing the file with the second other password; and,

storing the second other password in a password database.

Such a method is not taught by Nielsen. Nielsen does not contemplate a method of changing or updating passwords including the steps of "authorizing an individual requesting a change of the first password prior to changing the first password by determining a user authorization method having an associated security level sufficient for accessing the secured first password, where some user authorization methods have different associated security levels than others, and authorizing an individual according to the determined user authorization method" and "when the individual is authorized, providing a second other password for securing the plurality of files" as now claimed. Nielsen instead discloses a system in which a "master password" may be provided by a user to access a database of passwords that identifies the secure file or other secure information on a different computer and determines the correct associated password for the secure information on the different computer. Even if the "master password" used by Nielsen may be deemed to correspond to the claimed "second password" as noted by the Examiner, Applicant notes that Nielsen clearly does not teach the afore-mentioned steps of "authorizing an individual" and then "providing a second other password for securing the plurality of files" as now claimed. The "master password" taught by Nielsen clearly does not correspond to the claimed "second other password" and Nielsen clearly does not teach the claimed method of changing passwords. Accordingly, Nielsen does not anticipate the method of claim 11 or any of the claims dependent thereon and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 11 and dependent claims 15-19 as being anticipated by Nielsen is thus appropriate and respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 13 (the subject matter of which is now incorporated into claim 11), the Examiner alleged that Bellemore et al. teach authorizing an individual requesting the change of the password prior to changing of the password. Applicant submits that Bellemore et al. do not teach or suggest the shortcomings in Nielsen noted above with respect to independent claim 11 and certainly do not teach the afore-mentioned steps of "authorizing an individual" and then "providing a second other password for securing the plurality of files" as

now claimed. Accordingly, the teachings of Bellemore et al. are not believed to be particularly relevant to independent claim 11 as now amended. Claims 11-20 are thus believed to be allowable even if one skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Bellemore et al. with the teachings of Nielsen as the Examiner suggests.

Finally, with respect to claim 14 (the subject matter of which is also now incorporated into claim 11), the Examiner alleged that Brown et al. teach authorizing an individual according to the secure authorization method. As noted in the previous amendment response, Brown et al. do not teach determining a user authorization method having an associated security level sufficient for authorizing providing a second password for securing the plurality of files as now claimed. Thus, Applicant submits that Brown et al. also do not teach or suggest the shortcomings in Nielsen noted above with respect to independent claim 11 and certainly do not teach the afore-mentioned steps of "authorizing an individual" and then "providing a second other password for securing the plurality of files" as now claimed. Accordingly, the teachings of Brown et al. are not believed to be particularly relevant to independent claim 11 as now amended. Claims 11-20 are thus believed to be allowable even if one skilled in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Brown et al. with the teachings of Nielsen and Bellemore et al. as the Examiner suggests.

For these reasons, claims 11-20 are believed to be allowable over the teachings of Nielsen alone or in any proposed combination with the teachings of Bellemore et al. and Brown et al. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 11-20 is thus solicited.

Allowance of claims 1-10

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 1-10 are allowed. In view of the allowability of claim 11 as expressed above, claims 1-12 and 15-20 are believed to be allowable.

Conclusion


The present response is believed to obviate all rejections and objections of record. Entry of this Amendment, withdrawal of all rejections, and issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: IVPH-0041/12-52 US
Application No.: 09/625,547
Office Action Dated: December 1, 2005

Date: Monday, April 3, 2006

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116



Michael P. Dunnam
Registration No. 32,611